



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,588	10/16/2003	Chia-Lin Hsu	025796-00009	5130
7590	06/27/2005		EXAMINER	
AREN'T FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC Suite 400 1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20036-5339			EVERHART, CARIDAD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2891	

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AK

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/685,588	HSU ET AL.
	Examiner Caridad M. Everhart	Art Unit 2891

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 June 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

Claims 1-9, 16-19, 22, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by .Uzoh, et al (US 6,140,234).

Uzoh, et al disclose forming a metal interconnection pattern on a wafer(col. 1, lines 26-28). A thin barrier layer is formed which may be Ta or TaN(col. 2,lines 30-35). The method of deposition is sputtering, which is a PVD method(col. 2,lines 34-36). Copper is used for the metal pattern(col. 1, lines 11-15). The copper seed layer is formed by sputtering(col. 3, lines 55-57). CMP is used to planarize the layer (col. 2, lines 2, lines 8-10), as it is disclosed that CMP is known as the method of planarizing the layer.

Unwanted exposed edge barrier may be removed by edge bead removal (col. 6, lines 11-18). The barrier at the edge was left exposed after the unwanted metal was removed (col. 2, lines 50-65). The exposed barrier is removed by RIE or by CMP(col. 2, lines 61-65). Uzoh, et al discloses that there may be an anneal step(col. 3,lines 57-65). Although it is disclosed that this step is not preferred, it is still disclosed as a possible step. Fig. 4 shows that the metal is planarized.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 10,11,13,15,20, 21,232, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uzoh, et al in view of Emami, et al (US 6,857,941).

Uzoh, et al does not teach the backside material removal nor the drying of the wafer. backside unwanted metal nor the drying of the wafer.

Emami et al disclose the chemical-mechanical polishing of the edge of a wafer(col. 8, lines 63-65). The polishing solution may be a slurry(col. 7, lines 29-40 and col. 13, lines 40-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the teachings of Uzoh, et al could be combined with the teachings of Emami, et al because the edge bead removal could then be done with the polishing apparatus.

Claims 12, 24, 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uzoh, et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Vines et al (US 608789).

Uzoh, et al is silent with respect to nitric and hydrofluoric acid solution.

Vines et al teach that nitric and hydrofluoric acids are useful for cleaning wafers after CMP in the formation of metallization(abstract and col. 5,lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the step taught by Vines et al with the process taught by Uzoh, et al teach removal of barrier layer removal, which can be done using the acids taught by Uzoh, et al.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uzoh, et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kaufman, et al (US 2004/0009671A1).

Uzoh, et al is silent with respect to the pH of a slurry for the CMP step.

Kaufman et al teach the pH for removal of excess metal between 5.0 to 9.0, which overlaps the recited range.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the pH taught by Uzoh, et al in the process taught by Uzoh, et al in order to remove the excess metal in the pH range which is taught by Kaufman et al to be preferred for copper.

Claims 14, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uzoh, et al in view of Emami and Uzoh et al in view of Vines as applied to claims 13 and 23 above, and further in view of Sugai(JP2001044156).<sup>(abstract)</sup>

Uzoh et al in view of Emammi and Uzoh, et al in view of Vines are silent with respect to a basic slurry for CMP.

Sugai discloses a pH in the basic range and which includes the recited range for the materials of the barrier disclosed by Uzoh, et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the pH range disclosed by Sugai in the process taught by Uzoh, et al in view of Emami and Uzoh, et al in view of Vines because the barrier is made of the materials disclosed by Sugai.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Caridad M. Everhart whose telephone number is 571-272-1892. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Fridays 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, B. Baumeister can be reached on 571-272-1722. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
CARIDAD EVERHART  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT EXAMINER

C. Everhart  
6-23-2005